REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1-20 were rejected. Claims 1, 2, 7-9, 15, 19 and 20 are being amended. New claim 21 is being added. No new matter is being introduced by way of these amendments or new claim.

Certain paragraphs of the specification are being amended for clarification purposes. No new matter is being introduced by way of these amendments.

Before addressing the specific rejections in the office action at hand, Applicant believes that a brief description of the claimed invention may be useful.

Applicant's invention as recited in amended claim 1 provides a method of preserving a point-to-point protocol (PPP) session over a data network having mobile station handoff capability. The method includes establishing a first link of the PPP session, creating a second link associated with the PPP session, and releasing the first link while preserving the PPP session. The method also includes, by way of amendment, "identifying a correspondence between the first link and the second link prior to releasing the first link for uninterrupted communications during the PPP session."

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-11, 13, 15, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bhagwat (U.S. 6,651,105 B1).

Part 3 of the Office Action at hand describes Bhagwat as disclosing a method of preserving a PPP session by (1) establishing a first link of the PPP session, (2) creating a second link associated with the PPP session, and (3) releasing the first link while preserving the PPP session. However, Bhagwat does not disclose "identifying a correspondence between the first link and the second link prior to releasing the first link for uninterrupted communications during the PPP session."

For example, Bhagwat, column 9, lines 20-42 discloses that, when the backend server receives a session request message, the backend server can detect that the mobile device has an active PPP session and a PPP server running it. In this case, the backend server needs to change the binding of the PPP server to the new tunnel session. After the tunnel establishment and PPP traffic redirection procedure is complete, and a new virtual link between the mobile device and the backend server has been established, the PPP traffic starts flowing again. Thus, although

Bhagwat discloses a technique for preserving PPP sessions while mobile devices roam through ranges of multiple access points and only the underlying virtual links are changed (col. 9, lines 43-49), Bhagwat does not disclose identifying a correspondence between the links to provide for uninterrupted communications during the PPP session.

Further, in column 5, lines 5-11, Bhagwat discloses in reference to Fig. 3 that when the mobile device moves out of range of a first access point to the range of a second access point, the movement is detected and the backend server is requested to redirect the PPP traffic to the new tunnel session that is established between the second access point and the backend server. Because the backend server is requested (i.e., does not itself determine) to redirect the PPP traffic to the new tunnel session, it does not have knowledge of a correspondence between the first link (i.e., tunnel session) and the second link prior to releasing the first link. Therefore, Bhagwat discloses a method that cannot provide for uninterrupted communications during the PPP session because there is at least a small period of time to switch communications paths from the first tunnel session to the second tunnel session.

As noted in the Office Action at hand, Bhagwat does maintain a "table," as described in col. 7, lines 34-41-- but that table is not used for recording a correspondence between links-- it is instead used for authentication purposes only.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn because Bhagwat does not disclose every limitation of Applicant's amended claim 1 ("identifying a correspondence between the first link and the second link prior to releasing the first link for uninterrupted communications during the PPP session").

Claim 2 has been amended to further define the Multi-Link Point-to-Point Protocol (MLPPP) as one that is "normally used to add permanent link paths in parallel for large banks of modems coupled to a single stationary computer to provide temporary parallelism of the first and second links." Support for this amendment to claim 2 is found in the specification as originally filed at least at page 4, lines 16-24. While Bhagwat discloses use of PPP, amended claim 2 recites a particular type of PPP (i.e., MLPPP), which Bhagwat does not disclose. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn

for at least the reasons described above with reference to claim 1 and because Bhagwat does not disclose use of MLPPP as now recited in amended claim 2.

Because claims 3 and 5 depend from amended claim 1, these claims should be allowed for at least the same reasons.

Dependent claim 7 is being amended to recite, "maintaining at least one data table supporting correspondence between the first link and the second link for use in preserving the PPP session." Thus, for at least the same reasons as described in reference to claim 1 and in view of these amendments to claim 7, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 7 should be allowed under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Independent claim 8 is being amended to include similar claim limitations as amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 8 should be allowed under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for similar reasons as described above in reference to claim 1.

Claim 9 is being amended to include similar limitations as claim 2 and should be allowed for similar reasons as claim 8, from which claim 9 depends, and for reasons given above with reference to claim 2.

Because dependent claims 10, 11, and 13 depend from amended claim 8, these claims should be allowed for at least the same reasons.

Dependent claim 15 is being amended to include similar limitations as claim 7. For similar reasons, amended claim 15 should also be allowed.

Independent claim 19 is being amended to include similar limitations as amended claim 1 and should be allowed under 35 U.S.C.§ 102(e) over Bhagwat for similar reasons.

Similarly, independent claim 20 is being amended to include similar claim limitations as amended claim 1 and should be allowed for similar reasons.

Claims 4, 6, 12, 14, and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhagwat in view of Illidge (U.S. 2002/0085514 A1).

As stated in the Office Action at hand in section 15, Illidge discloses at page 4, paragraph 25 as part of a handoff procedure, reporting the Pseudorandom Noise (PN). Reporting the PN identity does not teach, suggest, or provide motivation for "identifying a correspondence between the first link and the second link prior to releasing the first link for uninterrupted communications

during the PPP session." Thus, neither Bhagwat nor Illidge, alone or in combination, teaches, suggests, or provides motivation for claims 1 or 8 as now recited.

Therefore, since claims 4, 6, 14, and 16-18 depend from amended claims 1 and 8, these claims should be allowed for at least the same reasons as described above.

New claim 21 is supported in the specification at least in Fig. 3 and page 8, lines 16 through page 9, line 8.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims (claims 1-21) are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By _Mark B. Solomon_
Mark B. Solomon
Registration No. 44,348
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133
Dated: 11/17/04